



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,455	06/26/2003	Paula J. Bates	09799910-0034	3317

26263 7590 06/29/2005

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. BOX 061080
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER

HUYNH, PHUONG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1644	

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/607,455	Applicant(s) BATES ET AL.	
	Examiner Phuong Huynh	Art Unit 1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE One MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

24

DETAILED ACTION

I. Claims 1-41 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

II. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

1. Claims 1-6, 10-16, 40 and 41, drawn to a **method of detecting apoptosis** by detecting at last one of nucleolin and PARP-1 in the sample using **anti-nucleolin antibody and anti-PARP-1 antibody**, classified in Class 435, subclass 7.1.
2. Claims 1-4, 7-9, 13-16, and 40-41, drawn to a **method of detecting apoptosis** by detecting at last one of nucleolin and PARP-1 in the sample using **guanosine-rich oligonucleotide to nucleolin binding molecule**, classified in Class 435, subclass 6.
3. Claims 17-24, drawn to a **kit for detecting apoptosis comprising an antibody that binds to nucleolin**, classified in class 435, subclass 810; Class 530, subclass 387.1.
4. Claims 17-24, drawn to a **kit for detecting apoptosis comprising an antibody that binds to PARP-1**, classified in class 435, subclass 810; Class 530, subclass 387.1.
5. Claims 17-22 and 25-27, drawn to a **kit for detecting apoptosis comprising a guanosine-rich oligonucleotide** that binds to either nucleolin or PARP-1, classified in class 435, subclass 810; Class 536, subclass 24.33.
6. Claims 28-33, drawn to a method of determining if a compound induces apoptosis using **anti-nucleolin antibody**, classified in Class 435, subclass 7.1.
7. Claims 28-30 and 34-36, drawn to a method of determining if a compound induces apoptosis using nucleoline binding molecule wherein the molecule is a **guanosine-rich oligonucleotide**, classified in Class 435, subclass 6, 9.41.

Art Unit: 1644

8. Claims 28-31 and 37-39, drawn to a method of determining if a compound induces apoptosis using **anti-PARP-1 antibody**, classified in Class 435, subclass 7.1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions of Groups 3-5 are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case, the products such as antibody and oligonucleotide as claimed differ with respect to its structure, biochemical properties and binding specificity.

Inventions of Groups 1-2 and 6-8 are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01).

The instant specification does not disclose that these methods would be used together. The methods of groups 1-2 and 6-8 as claimed are all unrelated, as they comprise distinct steps, and utilize different product.

Inventions of Groups 3-5 and Groups 1-2 and 6-8 are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the antibody as claimed can be used in detection assay as claimed as opposed to its use in screening assays.

- III. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and/or recognized divergent subject matter. Further, even though in some cases the classification is shared, a different field of search would be required based upon the structurally distinct products recited and the various methods comprising the distinct method steps. A prior art search also requires a literature search. It is an undue burden for the examiner to search more than one invention. Therefore restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- IV. Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed.

Art Unit: 1644

- V. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

- VI. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong Huynh "NEON" whose telephone number is (571) 272-0846. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 9:00 am to 5:30 p.m. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on (571) 272-0841. The IFW official Fax number is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 1644

VII. Any information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Phuong N. Huynh, Ph.D.

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 1600

June 24, 2005


CHRISTINA CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600